

REMARKS

Claims 14, 16-19 and 22 are now pending in the present application. Claim 14 has been amended, and Claims 1-6, 9-12, 20, 21, 23 and 25-27 have been cancelled, herewith. Entry of this amendment after final is requested as placing this case in condition for allowance or better form for appeal. Reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 103, Obviousness

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-5, 9-12, 23 and 26-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Patent No.: US 6,457,026 B1 issued to Graham et al. in view of Patent No.: US 6,684,386 issued to Hull et al., and further in view of Patent No.: US 6,363,352 issued to Dailey et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1-5, 9-12, 23 and 26-27 have been cancelled herewith without prejudice or disclaimer. Therefore, the rejection of Claims 1-5, 9-12, 23 and 26-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 has been overcome.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 103, Obviousness

The Examiner rejected Claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Patent No. US 6,457,026 B1 issued to Graham et al. in view of Patent No.: US 5,664,207 issued to Hull et al., and further in view of Patent No.: US 6,363,352 issued to Dailey et al. and Pub. No.: US 20030206189 A1 of DeMello et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 6 has been cancelled herewith without prejudice or disclaimer. Therefore, the rejection of Claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 has been overcome.

III. 35 U.S.C. § 103, Obviousness

The Examiner rejected Claims 14, 16-22 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Patent No. US 6,457,026 B1 issued to Graham et al. in view of Pub. No. US 2004/0199529 A1 of Clark et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

With respect to Claim 14, such claim has been amended herewith to include features of dependent Claim 21 (which is thus being cancelled herewith without prejudice or disclaimer). Claim 14 recites "receiving selected text from at least one remote electronic book through a communications link to the data processing system". As can be seen, selected text is received *from a remote electronic book* through a communication link. In addition, Claim 14 recites "responsive to a user input, sorting the selected text from the at least one remote electronic book using a selection criteria to form sorted text, wherein the selection criteria is received with the selected text". These claimed features advantageously provides ease of text collaboration between users of their respective electronic books, by allowing for receiving *both* (i)

selected text, and (ii) selection criteria which is used to sort the selected text. In rejecting Claim 21 (whose features are now a part of amended Claim 14), the Examiner cites Graham's FIG 2A as teaching the claimed feature of "wherein the selection criteria is received with the selected text". Applicants urge that FIG 2A, as described by Graham at Col. 3, lines 17-47, describes a user interface for viewing a document that has been annotated. A series of check boxes 206 permit a user to locally select which concepts of interest are to be noted in the document. In addition, miscellaneous navigation tools are found on a navigation toolbar 218 to facilitate navigation through a collection of documents. Importantly, this FIG 2A does not teach or otherwise suggest the *receiving of any type of selection criteria with the selected text*, where (1) the selected text is received from a remote electronic book through a communication link and (2) the selection criteria is used to sort the selected text that a received. It is therefore urged that amended Claim 14 (which has been amended to include features from dependent Claim 21) is not obvious in view of the cited references as there are missing claimed features not taught or suggested by any of the cited references¹.

Applicants traverse the rejection of Claims 16-19 and 22 for reasons given above with respect to Claim 14 (of which Claims 16-19 and 22 depend upon).

Claims 20, 21 and 25 have been cancelled herewith without prejudice or disclaimer.

Therefore, the rejection of Claims 14, 16-22 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 has been overcome.

¹ To establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all of the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. MPEP 2143.03. See also, *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 580 (C.C.P.A. 1974).

IV. Conclusion

It is respectfully urged that the subject application is patentable over the cited references and is now in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the Examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

DATE: May 31, 2006

Respectfully submitted,



Brian D. Owens
Reg. No. 55,517
Wayne P. Bailey
Reg. No. 34,289
Yee & Associates, P.C.
P.O. Box 802333
Dallas, TX 75380
(972) 385-8777
Attorneys for Applicants